

W. LIBRARY
HAM BLDG
DETROIT

1943

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

VOL. XXII, No. 6

BULLETIN

SEPTEMBER, 1943

Message from Their President to Members of the Child Welfare League of America

LEONARD W. MAYO

MY greatest regret at the time of the cancellation of the meeting of the National Conference of Social Work here in Cleveland was the fact that many of us would miss the opportunity to meet again as a League family. I am particularly glad, therefore, to write a few words of greeting to all of you at this time.

First, I wish to thank you for the continued confidence expressed by my re-election. All of us feel under deeper obligation than before during this period to give everything we can muster in the way of leadership to the League. The security of children is seriously threatened in these days, but at the same time unusual opportunities are presenting themselves whereby we may move forward in reaching new goals in their behalf. No thoughtful person, therefore, can fail to feel a sober responsibility as he accepts an office at the hands of the League's membership in these times.

Had I met you at an annual dinner meeting this year, I would have expressed then, as I wish to now, my own and Mr. Hopkirk's appreciation for the splendid backing given us by our Board and member agencies at every turn. There has been a substantial reflection of this and of the commitment which our members feel to the entire child welfare field in the increased support noted in both dues and general contributions. We are not yet out of the woods financially, but our position is sounder and more encouraging than it has been in several years. The yeoman service of Frank Pentlarge, Treasurer and Chairman of our Finance Committee, and Ernest Cole of the staff, is in no small measure responsible for this development.

I wish to express as well my own appreciation and

yours for the fine integrity, devotion, and ability that Mr. Hopkirk continues to bring to the position he occupies. The example he sets is emulated by the entire staff, both professional and clerical, who give unstinting service to the League and with a spirit that is both heartening and exemplary. I salute them all in your behalf.

Much of the League's attention during the last few months has been directed toward such critical war-

time problems as day care and delinquency. This is important to note among other reasons because it illustrates that child welfare services must always be sufficiently flexible to meet crises or emergencies as they arise. Day care, for example, is not a new service. It is, rather, an old service expressed now in a new form. Underlying and surrounding it is the continuing need for adequate foster home care in peace or in war and all of the continuing causes which create dependency and need. Underlying the problems of

CONTENTS

	Page
MESSAGE FROM THEIR PRESIDENT TO MEMBERS OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA.....	1
THE "MORE BETTER" BOYS.....	2
PAYMENT FEES IN DAY CARE.....	4
EDITORIAL.....	6
INTERPRETER'S COLUMN.....	7
RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE INSTITUTIONAL CHILD.....	8
REPORT ON INFORMATION SERVICE...	10
FINANCIAL GUIDE FOR HOMEMAKER SERVICE.....	12
NEW YORK COMMITTEE OF CASE RECORD EXHIBIT.....	12
BOOK NOTES.....	14

delinquency too are the causes of maladjustment existing in our communities and in many homes, and which must be constantly attacked in war or peace. The League does well to be continually aware of these new expressions of old problems, but it must not at any time lose sight of the basic causes from which they emerge.

We have had over two years of wartime experience now and, hence, we have some basis for lining up our present and future goals in fairly definite form and judging where we should go from here. Wherein have we been found wanting? Where are the real gaps? What services need strengthening? Has the war

(Continued on page 11)

The "More Better" Boys

When four little brothers spoke up through the press of their need for a home, and that it is "more better to be together," they soon found a home. But more than that, they found something for the service of other children who need homes.

JULIA E. HATCH

Case Supervisor, Brooklyn Children's Aid Society, Brooklyn, New York

ARTHUR didn't realize when he soberly explained to a sympathetic reporter that it was "more better" that the four of them should be together that all New York was listening. We didn't realize when we asked the Foster Home Campaign to publish a picture of a family group, for whom we needed a home, that we would have to gear our whole staff for a month to handling the press, the public, and the applicants for them.

Now that Arthur, George, Billy and "Fuffy" are placed and the excitement is over, we are interested in evaluating the experience for the community, the press, the agency, and the boys.

What are the implications of the fact that this story aroused such widespread community interest?

There were four of them, they were photogenic, and there was a somewhat incidental war interest. But actually it was "routine business" for a child placing agency—appealing because children are appealing—sad because any child who doesn't belong somewhere suffers deeply—and dramatic because the selection of a home for a child to grow in is a portentous responsibility. Are we failing the children and the public, who were so quick and warm in their response, that we do not share more often the appeal, the pathos, and the drama of what we are doing? For whom is the reproach when we complain that there is not enough interest in and support of our work?

And what of the newspapers that gave us front page spreads, and begged for more copy and more pictures?

We say it is hard to get the papers to carry social work publicity. We fear that reporters will overdramatize a situation, and that publicity exploits our clients' misfortunes. This experience with the papers was stimulating and reassuring. They were cooperative, interested in the welfare of the children, willing to leave out what might be detrimental to them, and anxious to present the material so that the publicity would be sound and helpful to children in general. The initial story was launched by the publicity man of the Foster Home Campaign, who had established a good working relationship with the

metropolitan press. From this well-planned start it went pretty much on its own momentum, with the Campaign publicity staff giving continued interpretation to the press and help to us in our relationship with reporters. We learned that given a human interest story with real public appeal the papers were eager and able to present the material safely and helpfully. We also learned that when we start something we are obligated to finish it, and that having aroused so much interest we had to give the press and the public a follow-up story about the new home that was found. We found the reporters an intelligent, cooperative group of people who, though adroitly and persistently pursuing a "scoop" for their papers, were responsive to the children's needs and considerate of their welfare. It was fun talking to them, and when it was all over I really missed having them around and starting each day with a friendly bout with them. We feel now that, when we have the wish and the need for publicity, the press is accessible, interested and can be worked with.

What did all of this do to the boys?

Certainly there were hazards and stress in it for them, and we are glad they found a good home together in return for the contribution they made. The first round of picture-taking they took in their stride, and rather enjoyed swaggering because their picture was in the papers. We were most apologetic to them for exposing them to a second round on the difficult day of placement, but we and the foster parents were convinced that it was less bad than having any publicity follow them into their new home. This time they were annoyed and a little bored by the whole procedure. They accepted our explanation that they were having their pictures taken again with little interest, and when the reporters and photographers came into the playroom, Fuffy looked up, sighed, and said firmly, "Well anyway, I'm going to finish my coloring first." They were a bit rebellious about posing, and when the men finally left, they burst into "noise." George stopped to ask politely, "Can we yell?" and when told it was all right, all four ran around war whooping for ten minutes. As far as we can see, it didn't have great

significance for them, and they have mentioned it only occasionally and casually since. They seemed to have no conception of the extent of the interest aroused, and took it more as children take pictures of a play they are in, than in relation to their insecure situation and need of a home.

What of the return in foster home applications?

Over 300 people telephoned or wrote, wishing to do something. Some of the offers were impractical, some impulsive, but almost without exception they seemed sincere and generous. A wealthy woman wished to take them to her estate for the summer. A New Orleans millionaire wanted to adopt them. A woman with six children, living in a railroad flat, offered to move to a bigger place and take them in. "We are all so sorry for the poor kids." A newspaper said they could easily raise money to send them to the best camp in the country, if that would help. It is not possible to say how many foster homes for other children were found, as out of state, Catholic and Jewish applicants were referred to many other agencies. However, our impression is that the story was too focused on these particular boys to be as immediately productive of applicants for other children as a more generalized appeal. Thirty applicants were possible as to location and religion. Of these only fourteen followed through, and came in for an interview, and only two seem to be working out for other children. We feel, however, applications may follow this interest well into the future. Certainly it meant a great deal to us to realize that in the midst of war and all its anxieties so many people on hearing of their need wished to do something about it.

Did this publicity reach people who would not ordinarily come to an agency for children?

We were very much interested that the urgency and quality of the response seemed so much like the offers made for English children. Although all types of families were represented, the majority came from the economic group who do not come to agencies offering to board a child. I think we have assumed such people will adopt, but not board, children. Are we justified in this? Certainly we recognize that many foster parents are not motivated by the board they receive. Devotion and personal sacrifice, bicycles, electric trains, party dresses and vacation trips, demonstrate that it is giving they seek. Have we any basis for assuming that a willingness to give and to give up, and a joy in the companionship of children, are limited to a particular economic group? Obviously prosperous homes must be considered

carefully in terms of the effect on own parents and their future plans for their children. But can we not plan most wisely for each child if we have the whole range of the American scene available to choose from? And if people who give leadership in their communities share their homes, will they not give increasing status to this important community service?

The home which added four little brothers to their already sizable family was one of those which would not have come to an agency asking to board children. The foster father has a position of some prominence, and they have a large and lovely home. More significantly, they are a family who have enjoyed the experience of parenthood. Their five children have been important and a pleasure to them. Their security has freed them to give their children a rich and full experience. The foster father wrote on his application that their reason for taking children was to do for some other children what they would hope someone would do for theirs in like circumstances. They were interested in agency procedures, enjoyed being studied, and were glad to find we were careful to really know families before placing children with them.

And so after, and because of, the burst of publicity, Arthur, George, Billy and Francis are part of an uncommonly happy family group, and are being much loved and much done for. The foster parents have handled their four different ways of expressing their uncertainty and fears with acceptance, humor and gentleness. They both feel and understand what all their experiences have meant to the boys, and recognize the implications of offering the security they need. They are concerned at the possibility of having the children come in to a city hospital if they should be ill and "particularly dependent on close contact with the people they love," and have suggested taking out hospital insurance, so that they could be cared for in a hospital near home.

The foster parents' own children have found living with four new brothers a bit complicated sometimes, but, on the whole, like their parents, find it fun. There have been adjustments with agency clothing standards, which the foster parents have made with tolerance and generosity. We know that this would be a difficult home to leave, but leaving is never easy for children. We can be sure that leaving the people in this home would loom much larger to these sensitive and reactive little boys than having extra bathrooms and wide lawns, and even special treats.

Any placement has some uncertainties in it, but we feel that the uncommon awareness, warmth and wisdom that are surrounding Arthur, George, Billy and Francis, the happiness they are having, justify our choice of this home for them, and give us reassuring conviction that they really benefited—as we learned a great deal—from "having their pictures in the papers."

Parents' Payments for Day Care Services— The Use of the Sliding Scale of Fees

IN THE field of day care there are, at present, two opinions regarding the financial responsibility of parents. In one opinion it is thought desirable to make a nominal charge for day care service so that all parents using it may bear an equal share of the cost. The other is based on a concept of a relationship between parents and the day care agency which shares responsibility for the care of children and the belief that a sliding scale of fees, related to family income, is one means of developing a more constructive and realistic participation.

In many day nurseries operated under private auspices and in those day care centers partially subsidized by Federal funds, a fixed rate of charges to parents is considered as one means of making the service available on a uniform basis to all in need of it, regardless of their social and economic status. The fixed charge is also regarded as necessary in order to ascertain a definite proportion of the cost of operating day care services, which will be met by the parents for whose children these services are designed.

The same objectives are also considered by those day nurseries and child care centers which are making use of a sliding scale of fees, related to income and size of family, in determining individual parents' payments for service to their children.

These two methods of determining the extent of parents' responsibility for meeting the cost of care are currently practiced, not only in group care programs but in programs which provide for individual care of children by the day in foster family homes.

It is evident that from an administrative point of view the first method is the simplest. However, the uniform, fixed fee, if sufficiently high to yield a fifty per cent or even a one-fourth reimbursement for operating expenses, is a lower proportion than many parents can well and willingly afford to pay. At the same time such a rate is frequently more than low income families can meet without hardship. Among the latter group are found the widow, the deserted wife, the woman whose husband is in military service or who for other reasons is the sole wage earner and support of a child in urgent need of day time care away from home. The average fee and the total income from fees may actually be higher for the center using a sliding scale than if a fixed charge were made sufficiently low to meet the requirements of

families with low incomes. To those day care agencies experienced in the use of a sliding scale of fees, the administrative problem involved is not a great one.

The sliding scale if used realistically and constructively for parents must, of course, be based on current living costs and wages, with consideration for the number in each family dependent on the income. The range of the scale should be graded upward from a small minimum charge to a figure representing the full per capita cost in relation to various levels of income. For example, a family of four, consisting of parents and two children, one of whom is in care of the day nursery, has an income of \$35.00, which represents the mother's earnings; the father temporarily incapacitated. The weekly fee for one child is \$1.95. The father recovers and resumes work at a moderate wage. The combined net earnings of these parents, Social Security taxes and union dues deducted, total \$62.00. The fee is increased to \$4.30. The second child is admitted to the nursery. The combined fees for both children are \$5.70. The father's wage is increased. Net weekly income then totals \$70.00. The fee for one child is raised to cover the full weekly cost of care, while the fee for the second child is proportionately increased. When there is a further wage increase, these parents will then be in a position to pay the cost of care for both children, but may also expect an adjustment if at any time the total net income drops.

Table showing portion of a sliding scale of fees—

Number in Family	Number of Children	Total Net Income Weekly	Weekly Fee	
			1 Child	2 Children
4	2	\$32.50-37.50	\$1.95	\$2.85
		37.50-42.50	2.40	3.30
		42.50-47.50	2.95	3.85
		47.50-52.50	3.50	4.40
		52.50-57.50	4.15	5.05
		57.50-62.50	4.80	5.70
		62.50-67.50	5.55	6.45
		67.50-72.50	6.30	7.20

The advantages of the tabulated fee scale over a sliding scale, which is the result of the individual computation of family budgets, are considerable. One day nursery for many years discussed with parents the details of each family budget. On this basis was determined, family by family, the amount

of fee each could pay. At the point of setting up a tabulated fee scale all budgets of families whose children were in care were reviewed. It was found that many families of the same size and having identical incomes were paying different amounts. In studying this situation further it was seen that each family was defining the financial value of nursery service in terms of other expenditures. Fees, therefore, were related to the individual family's decision as to the proportion of income spent on new furniture, clothing or recreation, rather than to the total income and the need of the child for nursery care. This raised the question as to whether or not the day nursery should be concerned with the way a family budgets expenditures, or should focus the fee-setting process on the service requested. Since parents were not coming to the day nursery to ask for help in budget making, but were requesting care for their children, it was felt that their right to solve their own economic problem in their own way should be respected and that the nursery's only responsibility in determining the amount of the fee to be charged would be an objective definition of fee in relation to income. Arriving at this conclusion actually resulted in a clearer definition of the nursery's function and philosophy of offering service. Use of a tabulated sliding scale of fees made it possible to avoid the common pitfall of giving financial advice to parents, when they had not sought it and which so often they reject, and to focus the discussion of fees, where it belongs, on a consideration of the joint responsibility of parents and day nursery for the care of a child.

It is in the process of defining this joint responsibility that a day nursery can give the most constructive service to parents. In this process, the fee plays an important part. When parents apply for the admission of a child to a day nursery they are saying in effect: "We have a problem in providing adequate care for this child and so we come asking that the nursery share this responsibility with us. We do not wish to give him up. If the nursery can keep him during the day, we believe that this service will enable us to meet our other difficulties. The problem of caring for this child is the one on which we are ready to work with the nursery." If the day nursery is clear about its responsibility for meeting this request it may well reply: "Very well, this building and this staff are here for the purpose of meeting the need of your child, but without your constant help we are unable to serve him. If we admit him for care, we must begin and continue to share responsibility with you for his health, his training and his use of all the experiences which he will have here and which are

related inseparably to the experiences he has at home. It is only through establishing and maintaining a close relationship and mutual confidence between you, his parents, and ourselves that we can hope to be of use to him and to you. The nursery receives a definite allowance from the community with which to meet a part of the expense for operating this service. Parents share in meeting these expenses as they share other responsibilities with us. We can show you the proportionate share of expense, if you will tell us about your earnings and keep us posted on any change of income."

It is here that the nursery begins with the parent to define the new relationship. The fee represents not only a source of income with which the nursery pays its bills, but one of the many pegs which hold together this relationship for the benefit of the child. Such a definition leaves no room for social investigation, including the verification of parents' wages, formerly a part of the intake process of many nurseries. It makes unnecessary the task of family budgeting, unless the parents themselves request this help in terms of meeting the child's need for nursery care or in terms of their own need to solve the problem of care in some other way.

Often the question of fee will be the point at which parents may decide that they do not want the nursery's service. The requirement of a definite payment which involves more responsibility than the parents are willing to carry helps them to know that they actually do not want to work with the nursery for their child's interests. They may begin to realize that what they do want is to have someone relieve them of more responsibility for him. Eventually they may decide on full-time placement. The fee requirement has helped many mothers in conflict about taking a job or continuing to work to make the choice of remaining at home with their children.

The values of the fee, which is more than a nominal unrealistic charge, are manifold. The use of the fee as a constructive tool depends to a great extent, however, upon the skill of the staff worker, in whose hands it may become a creative factor in the development of parent-day nursery relationships.

—ALICE T. DASHIELL

THE 1943 Case Record exhibit is available on request to members free of charge except expressage and to affiliates and associates at a fee of \$5.00 per week plus expressage.

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America.

Henrietta L. Gordon, *Editor*

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00

Single copies, 10c.

Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

No Place For a Child

A BABY, probably three weeks old, told all passengers that he was aboard the bus. It was a hot September afternoon, and the New York rush-hour crowd made the heat doubly oppressive, and the bus no place for a baby.

Such smiles as greeted the wee passenger did not hide furtive glances from some of the best dressed men and women who clearly were wondering, "Why did the woman bring her child into this sweltering rush-hour crowd?" And since the tone of his crying was that of a sick baby, I also felt like asking the question.

Speculations soon placed the child in several situations, any one of which required him to travel in that bus. Obviously, the mother could not afford a taxi. She may have had the child at a clinic, there being several in the neighborhood. He may have spent the day at a nursery. His mother may have been carrying her points and pennies where she could shop within her means at the end of her working day.

But how different is this child from thousands of others in this same city and hundreds of thousands in our country? The child who lives in a trailer or in a tiny room, who may have been born in a setting unsuitable both for him and his mother, also is seriously out of place. Must so many boys and girls be in places which are not suitable even for adults?

Children in their early teens or even younger who work at the tasks of adults may be brave but certainly they also seem seriously out of place. And the summer of 1943, filled with hard work for many youngsters, will be followed for too many of them by an autumn lacking the school days which we consider the birthright of every American child. Evidence of this summer's tragedies to child workers is coming in and it will resemble much of that published by the National Child Labor Committee in March, 1943,¹ in reporting the results of improper use of child labor during the preceding year.

¹"Child Manpower in 1943," by Gertrude Folks Zimand, National Child Labor Committee, 419 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

"An eleven-year-old girl since the closing of school has been doing a man's work in the fields. Often she found it necessary to lie down in the furrows to rest and finally suffered a heart attack."

"Twenty-four children, 10 to 15 years of age, started work at 3.00 a. m. and capped strawberries until 7.00 a. m., when they stopped to eat breakfast and go to school."

"A thirteen-year-old boy lost his arm when the sleeve of his sweater was entangled in a threshing machine."

Children are losing out in ways which are even more confusing to them than these. They can understand why it is necessary to work, but not why the emotional tensions within their families are mounting. Parents themselves, confused and weary, too often are in conflict with one another and with their children. In a war defense city noted for its production of sturdy airplanes there is a dangerous overtaxing of the emotions and physical stamina essential for sturdy family life. A letter just received from a member of the League in this community reports: "All of which looks to us as if the amount of emotional instability is mounting rapidly in our community and that children being the victims of unstable adults are becoming in turn unstable persons."

Those who support agencies for the protection and care of children should realize that during the coming months the child welfare resources of our country will be on trial. Are children to have a planned place or only a cramped and leftover corner in American life? Will the membership of the Child Welfare League, which always has stood for superior services to children, be reminding the public and itself that there are school attendance and child labor laws? Will they be budgeting for the additional services needed as the demands for child protection, foster care and day care increase? Will they participate in the recruiting of capable young people for graduate study in social work and participate in other long-range planning?

The Child Welfare League's own conscience is active, as indicated by an excerpt from the June 11th minutes of the Board of Directors: "It is the responsibility of the League to assume dynamic and intelligent leadership in the protection of children and in gaining recognition for the priority of child welfare interests in our program for national defense. . . . It has been observed that in some other countries there has been adopted a more aggressive, statesman-like policy with respect to children with the result that more of the nation's resources are being utilized to help large numbers of children."

—HOWARD W. HOPKIRK

The Interpreter's Column

Every month the National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare Services, 130 East 22d Street, New York, N. Y., discusses the contents of the BULLETIN from the standpoint of its possibilities for community education.

In this issue of the BULLETIN, Dr. Mayo, in his message to members, points the way not only to the responsibility for militant planning which faces children's workers, but, indirectly, he sounds the interpretation keynote for the year to come, and, we would hope, for all the years to come. We are referring particularly to two of his statements: "We have, in other words, done a creditable job of 'medical care' in child welfare; we must now press forward with a program of 'health education,' and, 'finally, we can start all of this in a modest but effective way in our communities, at the same time mustering the courage to demand public and private funds required to some where near accomplish the objectives we envisage."

A quick review of social work interpretation, including the interpretation of children's work, will bear us out that up to now the bulk of what we have said has been confined to descriptions of children *already in trouble*, of parents *already* facing intolerable crises, of what services we are giving *after* calamity has fallen on individual families and children, and on whole groups within our communities. Very little has been said in our publicity to indicate either that our agencies are aware of the underlying causes of these calamities, or that we are competent or even desirous of attacking them. This is not to say that we are *not* aware or competent—but it is certainly true that we have not so far proved it in our publicity. Social work has shied away from controversial issues, from "politics," from community battles. Too many of us have been willing to sit by without joining in the fray itself, waiting in readiness to take up our inevitable job of caring for the casualties resulting from the lost battle for better legislation and better community facilities.

After, as Dr. Mayo exhorts, we muster our courage, there is more mustering to be done. Indispensable among the factors to be mustered is a strong public education campaign for those advances in the welfare of children which we consider important. Without strong community interpretation, these advances will never be achieved, because children's agencies cannot achieve them alone. The community must be taken into the fight, and the community will respond to our call for help only when it has been told a clear, factual and vivid story of what the needs are and what can be done about them.

Charles Livermore, assistant director of the National CIO Committee for American and Allied War Relief, says in the September issue of *Channels*:* "At every point where the actual specific services end, it is necessary for the agencies to so indicate, frankly and clearly. There is no point in trying . . . to solve problems which require more services than are available or other answers than social workers can provide. At that point the unions and other progressive forces in the community should join hands in whatever kind of social action seems necessary. Any other approach can lead only to disillusionment, dissatisfaction and discredit to social work."

It is fervently to be hoped that Dr. Mayo's appeal and the resolution in Mr. Hopkirk's editorial in this issue will form the agenda for meetings of Boards of Directors of children's agencies all over the country this fall, and that out of these discussions will come plans for a strong and cooperative program of public education.

Miss Hatch's warm and delightful article, "The 'More Better' Boys," should throw additional light on the eternal question of using actual children in social work publicity. She opens up, too, a provocative vista of other publics than the ones we ordinarily try to reach in foster homefinding. Here, because the subject is treated with objectivity, skill and recognition of possible dangers, is ammunition to be used with the more timorous of your associates when the question of publicity comes up. For those children's workers seriously concerned about the pro's and con's of using photographs themselves, Frances Lockridge, of the State Charities Aid Association in New York, as early as April, 1942, contributed some notes from experience in a *Channels** article entitled "Is Your Agency Camera Shy?"

* *Channels*, official organ of the National Publicity Council.

What Children Need in Wartime

How would you present to your Board concisely and interestingly the basic fundamental needs of all children during this period of crisis?

The United States Children's Bureau Commission on Children in Wartime has issued a "Children's Charter," which sets forth in concise and vivid language all needs of our children in these times.

If you have not already seen a copy you will wish to send for one in care of the Child Welfare League of America. They are available at the following prices: 5 cents for a single copy, plus 4½ cents postage, or 10 cents. In lots of 10 to 25, 4 cents each; 25 or more, 3 cents plus postage or express charges.

Residential Institutions and the Institutional Child

The Freud-Burlingham "Foster Parents' Plan for War Children" monthly reports of their experiences with children in the nursery continue to supply us with valuable clinical material on child care. The June and September issues give detailed observations of the reactions of children of various age groups to institution living and to the adults assigned to their care. These reports confirm and elucidate the experiences we have had with children in institutions, particularly with reference to a child's use of an intimate relationship with an adult. We are presenting some excerpts from these two reports. They should be read in full.

—H. L. G.

1. "The Institutional Child between Birth and Two Years.

"It is recognized among workers in education and in child psychology that children who have spent their whole life in institutions (for instance, orphanages) present a type of their own and differ in various respects from children who develop under the conditions of family life. Knowledge about the nature of these differences has been gained partly through individual observation where such institutional children have in later life turned dissocial or criminal (see Aichhorn, *Wayward Youth*), partly through group observation of large numbers of children evacuated as babies to residential nurseries during this war. Superficial observation of children of this kind leaves a conflicting picture. They resemble, so far as outward appearances are concerned, children of middle class families: They are well developed physically, properly nourished, decently dressed, have acquired clean habits and decent table manners and can adapt themselves to rules and regulations. So far as character development is concerned, they often prove—to everybody's despair and despite many efforts—not far above the standard of destitute or neglected children. This shows up especially after they have left the institutions. It is because of these failures of development that in recent years thoughtful educationalists have more and more turned against the whole idea of residential institutions as such, and have devised methods of boarding out orphaned or destitute children with foster families. But since all efforts of this kind will probably not be able to do away altogether with the need for residential institutions, it remains a question of interest how far failures of the kind described are inherent in the nature of such institutions as distinct from family life and how far they

could be obviated if the former were ready and able to change their methods.

"Careful comparison of our own residential children with children of the same ages who live with their own families has taught us some interesting facts. Advantages and disadvantages vary to an astonishing degree according to periods of development.

"*Birth to five months:* Babies between birth and about five months of age, when not breast-fed under either condition, develop better in our nursery than in the average proletarian household . . . The reasons are not difficult to find: more carefully prepared food, with variations in the food formulas whenever necessary; plenty of air (outdoor life whenever the weather permits); less economy in laundry; skilled and regular handling and removal from the disturbances of a proletarian household in restricted quarters.

"*Five to twelve months:* In the second half of the first year the picture changes definitely to our disadvantage. Whenever we have an opportunity to compare our 5-12 months old babies with family babies out of average homes we are struck with the greater liveliness and better social response of the family child. . . . Its ability to imitate, which it develops from the 8th month onward, is stimulated in a lesser degree where contact with the grown-up is less frequent or less close, or has to be divided between several grown-ups as is inevitable in a nursery. Even where our residential babies are stronger and healthier these differences in intellectual and emotional development are sufficient to make the private baby appear more 'advanced' and therefore more satisfactory. The comparative backwardness of the residential baby at this stage is due to the comparative unfulfillment of its emotional needs, which at this age equal in importance the various needs of the body.

. . . the nursery child, who only receives individual attention when fed, bathed or changed, is at a disadvantage. . . . Attention of this kind has of course to be given by the mother-substitute to whom the child is attached and 'voluntary workers.'

. . .

"*One to two years of age:* I. Muscular control: With the beginning of the second year the scales are turned again in our favor. The great event in the child's life is his new ability to move freely and to control his movements, an ability which progresses quickly from crawling to walking, running, climbing, jumping, and is continued with the handling and moving of objects, as pushing, pulling, dragging,

carrying, etc. These differences in activity and earlier control of movement through exercise and opportunity create the appearance of enormous precocity of development of the nursery child.

"II. *Speech Development*: But it would be a serious mistake to overestimate the advantages gained in this field and not to correlate them with retardations and disadvantages which occur at the same time in other spheres of the child life. . . . Whenever we compare our nursery children over one year with private children in this respect we find that they compare unfavourably . . .

"Inquiries in other residential nurseries have confirmed the impression gained in our own. When children are home on visits, for instance, at Christmas, or during their mothers' holidays, they sometimes gain in speech in one or two weeks what they would have taken three months to gain in the nursery. Similarly there are many examples of children brought up at home who lose their newly acquired ability to speak during an absence of the mother.

"III. *Habit Training*: The third important task to be achieved or at least partially achieved during the child's second year is habit training. Here again the residential child is at a disadvantage. It is easier within the routine of a nursery than under the pressure of work in an ordinary household to be clean, orderly, punctual and hygienic about habit training; but wherever forcible methods are not used, the results of habit training are slow to come under residential conditions. . . .

"The child's muscular skill and independence, gained in the nursery as described above, plays no part in the development of cleanliness.

"IV. *Feeding*: The position is again completely different where eating is concerned. There is a marked difference between the child's reaction to food under home and residential conditions, but on this point the advantages are on the side of the residential child, or at least they may be so if the institutional setting is favorable. This means that in most institutions the children are 'good eaters,' i.e., are interested in their food and enjoy it if it is good, and that eating difficulties are on the whole less prevalent than in private homes. . . ."

We can now understand why it is that the conscientious and anxious mothers produce eating difficulties, whereas the negligent mothers have children who eat well.

Under institutional conditions the absence of the mother, which is a serious drawback in so many ways,

proves in this respect for once an advantage. There are certainly institutional children who eat too much for emotional reasons: they try to substitute the satisfaction of one instinctual urge (hunger) for the satisfaction of another (love). But on the whole in an institution feeding is a matter of eating as such, without the idea of a mother figure interpolated between the child and the food. Food is liked for its own sake, and eating is one of the recognized pleasures of all institutional life.

This pleasure can, of course, be spoiled or lessened if it is surrounded with too much discipline, as for instance long waiting, which at this age is an excessive strain; sitting quiet, which is never again so difficult as in the toddler stage; insistence on table manners, i.e., use of the spoon before use of an instrument comes naturally; insistence on eating everything and on "eating up." The pleasure in eating can on the other hand be greatly strengthened if the child is allowed some freedom of movement, some freedom of choice regarding type and quantity of food, and if manners are not considered important in themselves but allowed to develop as a natural result of growing skill. It is for purely practical reasons easier to give the child this freedom in an institution than in a family.

Since the child in an institution never eats alone, mealtimes, with the pleasure they bring, can be made to play an important part in the child's development towards taking pleasure in social life, and adaptation to it.

"Preliminary Summary.

"To sum up: The institutional child in the first two years has advantages in all those spheres of its life which are independent of the emotional side of its nature; it is at a disadvantage wherever the emotional tie to its mother or to the family is the main-spring of development. Comparisons between children under these contrasting conditions serve to show that certain achievements, such as speech and habit training, are closely related to the child's emotions, even though this may not be apparent at first glance.

"The Introduction of the Mother Relationship into Nursery Life.

"It is a fallacy to conclude that the variety of emotions which the small child in a residential institution develops towards the playmates in its own age group can make up in any way for the emotions which it would normally direct towards its parents.

The latter remain undeveloped and unsatisfied, but many occasions show that they are latent in the child and leap into action the moment the slightest opportunity for attachment is offered by the outward circumstances. This is all the more noticeable, the less a child has knowledge of, or opportunity to form, emotional attachment to its own mother.

"D. Spontaneous Attachments to a Grown-Up."

"We have shown before how quickly the latent parent child relation becomes manifest, for instance, when opportunity is offered through formation of artificial family groups. But these inner urges of the child do not always wait for carefully thought-out arrangements. They arise in answer to actions of the grown-ups; whoever merely takes care of a child for any length of time in a motherly way may easily become the chosen foster mother of this child. But children choose their foster mothers too where no previous action on the part of the grown-up has provoked the process; it seems at first sight as if they chose at random. Closer investigation of every such occurrence shows that these apparently spontaneous attachments of the children really arise in answer to a feeling in the grown-up person, in many cases a feeling of which the grown-up was not aware in the beginning. . . ."

It is essential for all people who live and work in close contact with children to realize the existence of these emotional moves in themselves and through realization gain control over them. Though the adult in the nursery serves as object and outlet for the emotions which lie ready in the child, the children should on no account serve as outlets for the uncontrolled and therefore unrestrained emotions of the adults, irrespective of whether these emotions are of a positive or negative kind.

Report on The League's Information Service

AT THE time of the reorganization of the program of the Child Welfare League of America, there had been "so little doubt" as to the demand for an information service that plans for its establishment got under way immediately. There was consensus of opinion that a channel for exchange of experience in the field of child welfare, both public and private, was necessary. This would bring to workers the adaptations in services to children, and what was entailed in effect-

ing these adaptations, new methods and forms being developed, modifications in established methods that seemed called for. Such a channel would make available also material showing trends in the field of child welfare. That the publications service would naturally be related to the information service was also recognized.

What requests for help have been made, and how have these requests been met? Each year a report of this service is made to the board of directors. At its last meeting the board of directors decided to make this report available to our membership as well as to the readers of the BULLETIN.

We have been serving an increasing number of agencies and individuals. Just to compare 1941 and 1942: In 1941, out of a total of 453 inquirers, 80 were member agencies and 13 were affiliates and associates; between June 1942 and June 1943, out of a total of 700 letters of inquiry, 120 were from member agencies and 48 from affiliates and associates. In each instance, the remainder were from agencies and individuals, including students in the field of child welfare and in related fields.

The inquiries cover about fifty subjects included under the broad topics of agency administration, organization, function, case work, and community planning for child care and protection. About fifty individuals have inquired each year about where to get a baby for adoption. Schools of social work and councils of social agencies have been using the information service in increasing numbers.

The subjects of inquiry reflect the community concern for increasing and changing need and for ways of meeting that need. This year the greatest number of requests for help in the order of their frequency were on problems of foster care, both in family homes and in institutions; wartime planning; day care programming and practice in day care centers, day nurseries and foster day care. Concern about foster home finding with its problems of interpretation and publicity, case work techniques and board rates has been manifested by increasing numbers of inquiries. Questions on personnel practices reflect the concern about staff shortages. Inquiries on illegitimacy and juvenile delinquency, too, have been on the increase. Requests for record forms and administrative forms continue to make their demands.

How have these requests and inquiries been handled? It is obvious that the information service can serve as a pool, and channel material only as it receives it. Our sources are agencies in this and other fields and publications. On more current matters, selected

agencies have been requested to submit material from their particular experience. This is then formulated for the inquirer. On questions of wider concern, inquiries have been sent to the entire membership and the results assembled, analyzed and reported back to the entire membership in special bulletin form. On occasion special committees have been charged with the responsibility to gather and formulate material. Other requests have been the basis for specially invited articles to the BULLETIN. This year, for example, there were three articles on home finding, four on foster home care and three on board rates. There were five articles on various aspects of day care and five on wartime planning. Problems of personnel were discussed in two articles. Institutional care, protective services, juvenile delinquency, and adoption, were considered in one article each. Actually our entire publication service is related to the information service and is used to interpret trends in the field and to bring to our readers material through articles and pamphlets on the subjects of greatest concern. It is for this reason that more than half of all the publications have been solicited to cover subjects on which there were numbers of inquiries and limited published material.

In addition we have been developing our lending library. This consists of both original and reprinted magazine articles, papers delivered at conferences—local, regional and national—some which may not be published but which may nevertheless serve for stated situations. We may either cull material which is sent in letter form, or we may send the material itself for a period of study by the inquirer. During the 1942-1943 period, 556 pieces of material were circulated in answer to requests for information.

Furthermore, because we cannot hope to fill every request for help, no matter how generously the membership responds to our appeal to report spontaneously their experiments and modifications in planning and practice, we have developed reciprocal working relations with other national agencies and with the U. S. Children's Bureau. Thus we refer to those and receive from them inquiries which each may be better able to answer. Over 170 inquiries were relayed to other sources of information this past year.

Comments, suggestions, criticisms of this service will serve to improve it. You are urgently requested to communicate them fully.

—H. L. G.

Message from Their President to Members of the Child Welfare League of America

(Continued from page 1)

shown that we need a new approach in developing child welfare services? These and related questions face us now with a critical persistence.

The following suggestions are submitted for your thoughtful consideration in this connection:

1. We have not yet seen, let alone plotted or budgeted, the kind of overall program essential for the well-being of the children of America. The National Resources Planning Board outlined a part of such a program but it is up to us to both fill in the fine lines and see the whole more clearly.

2. The League has pioneered in case work service in raising standards of practice and in pressing for qualified personnel. It should now pioneer in promoting broad measures and proposals, such as legislation, designed to protect, aid and otherwise serve large groups of children. We have, in other words, done a creditable job of "medical care" in child welfare; we must now press forward with a program of "public health." We have served some children via case work service, we must now serve all children via protective legislation, the extension of educational opportunities, the development of broad maternity care plans, the regulation of child labor, the creation of comprehensive recreational opportunities, and the like.

3. We must raise our sights to bring within our purview not only our own children but the children of the world. Directly here at home and indirectly in the administration of occupied countries, we must play a part as individual agencies and as a network of agencies to the end that the policies and practice of postwar reconstruction will center largely around the interests of all children and all families everywhere.

4. On the national and local levels we need far more effective working relations between family and child welfare agencies and between the various agencies devoted to children's services. The League has an active committee at work on the former which will soon report. We all need to work on both objectives more assiduously, as the war has revealed.

5. Finally, we can start all of this in a modest but effective way in our own communities, at the same time mustering the courage to demand the public and private funds required to somewhere near accomplish the objectives we envisage.

A successful and exciting year to all of you!—as indeed it will be if executives, staff, and Board members move forward in response to the pull we all feel to make history for child welfare in the days and months ahead.

Financial Guide for Homemaker Service

THE Cleveland Associated Charities has prepared the following financial guide for estimating the ability of a family requiring homemaker service to meet some of the cost. Obviously, such budget planning will need to be modified to satisfy the varying cost of living in different sections of the country. They state:

"Budget Plan: The financial plan with the family is important. Maintenance items of the budget would be recognized as most necessary for the family to meet first. It is recommended that items such as debt payments, insurance, personal expenses, and clothing allowance be temporarily deferred or reduced whenever possible, in order that the cost of the service can be wholly or partially assumed by the

Manual. In a temporary situation it is strongly advised that a definite time *within the period of service* be agreed upon for the payment to be made. Weekly or bi-weekly payments may be worked out depending upon the pay day of the wage earner and the family's method in managing.

"If agreement for payment is not kept and the family does not have an acceptable reason for not meeting this obligation, homemaker service may be terminated. Regular payments are a realistic basis for any consideration of continued service."

Interesting, too, is their statement of purpose and procedure prepared for the referring agency and for its workers' manual. This is available for circulation from the League's lending library.

FINANCIAL GUIDE FOR REFERRAL FOR HOMEMAKER SERVICE

The following figures are to serve merely as a *guide for the referring person* in judging whether the family's income is such that they can expect some charge will be made for Homemaker Service. How much they can pay will depend on the *actual* budget as figured out by this agency's caseworker and the family.

For example: If a family with 2 children has an income of \$150.00, the referring person in noting the range (\$111.20-\$128.70) for that sized family could say to the family that it looked to him as though they could help defray the cost of the homemaker's wages. The amount they could pay would depend on their actual expenditures and what temporary adjustments they could make. To facilitate the budget discussion he would suggest that they bring to their interview with this agency's caseworker, bills, etc., that would affect the budget planning.

	2 Adults 2 Children	2 Adults 3 Children	2 Adults 4 Children	2 Adults 5 Children	2 Adults 6 Children
Food Range.....	\$46.10-\$57.75	\$53.25-\$66.50	\$64.35-\$81.25	\$73.10-\$94.20	\$87.00-\$99.85
Rent.....	30.00	32.50	32.50	35.00	35.00
Fuel, Light and Gas.....	13.55	13.55	13.55	14.65	14.65
Transportation.....	5.40	5.40	5.40	5.40	5.40
Household.....	1.75	2.15	2.55	2.70	3.10
Clothing Range.....	14.50-20.10	18.65-25.00	22.90-30.10	25.10-35.15	30.10-37.80
Total Range.....	\$111.30-\$128.55	\$125.50-\$145.10	\$141.25-\$165.35	\$155.95-\$187.10	\$175.25-\$195.80

family. Such a plan would tend to give the service more value and meaning to the family in terms of its willingness to participate and make adjustments for a short period of time. The longtime budget should be compared to the total income to be sure there is enough money to make up these deferred payments later.

"Discussion of budget and possibilities for paying something for the service will give the family opportunity to choose this service or make other plans for the children's care.

"In figuring the budget the homemaker's wages should be included and totalled with the other budget items. The difference between the total budget and the family's income would be the amount of supplementation to be given by the agency for homemaker service. Including homemaker's wages makes the plan more realistic in terms of the need and family's understanding of the service.

"Plan of Payment: Same as for regular homemaker service. See Vol. I, Sec. T, p. 2, paragraph 5, of the

Report by New York Committee of Case Record Exhibit

SHALL there be a case record exhibit in 1944? There was some question late in 1942 as to whether we should sponsor an exhibit for 1943. The consensus of opinion is evidenced by the fact that the 1943 Case Record Exhibit is now assembled. It has already started on its tour of agencies. This exhibit numbers one hundred twenty-four records. Of the sixty-one agencies which contributed to the exhibit, twenty-seven agencies made their first contribution. There is some new and interesting material also. Six records have been submitted on day care. Included are intake, counseling and foster day care placement. Case work situations that have been complicated by war-created conditions are accounted for in twenty-six records. The protective services have contributed

records showing a developing technique for working with parents though their children must be removed through court action.

We see in this exhibit concrete evidence of the recognition by members of the League that the war makes it the more necessary to strengthen and extend social services to children and their families.

As we approach the time for activities necessary for assembling the next year's exhibit, the question again arises—shall there be a 1944 exhibit? The following letter from one of the chairmen expresses a point of view that we would like to share with all our member agencies since in truth the exhibit is their responsibility:

As chairman of the New York region of the 1943 Case Record Exhibit, I want you to know that the experience was very stimulating, and I learned a tremendous lot. It seemed before I started as if there weren't time enough in this busy world to take on more work, but there was!

I am attaching a draft of the letter I planned to send to the agencies which did not participate in the exhibit last year, which summarizes this Committee's thinking. This is the letter:

The Selection Committee of the 1943 Record Exhibit had a most interesting experience together this past year, and we want to tell you about it.

When we met last winter for our first meeting, we were floored by the size of the job we had undertaken. There were ten of us, supervisors and case workers representing different experiences and philosophy. Most of us felt responsibility for the selection of our individual agency's records for the Committee's reading, as well as the responsibility as committee members for reading and selecting the records submitted to the exhibit by other agencies. We said we all believed that it was important to have a Record Exhibit, but we were pretty grim about it. (We set a time for the next meeting at which we planned to read and discuss records.)

From the time we started reading and discussing records, the focus shifted from ourselves and our agencies to the broader field of case work. It was a test to have our agency records discussed in our presence by other agency representatives and to remain objective in the face of differences. We were all surprised that we could take it and like it! It was as if we had found a channel of knowledge and experience to which each contributed and from which each drew, that had meaning for us all, a flow from the agency into the wider stream of practice and from that stream back into the agency. We said that a record exhibit was valuable if it could open up such a channel, and we as a committee wanted to stay on and "dig deeper." We would like other agencies to share in the experience we had and for this reason we are writing you.

We found that it was important that we had actually read the previous exhibit. Those of us who

had used the exhibit with our staffs and had centered discussion around selected records read by all, had reaped stimulating results. Here again the two-way channel operated. We found that case workers benefited in their own practice, and were active as well in choosing records for the next year's exhibit identifying with the larger field. We said that an annual Record Exhibit was valuable that places emphasis on the case worker's performance in her own agency, as well as in the broader field of child welfare.

We were not uncritical of certain aspects of the exhibit, feeling that it was large, unencompassable, and unfocused, but we know that that is true of current practice which is its purpose to exhibit. We have a strong conviction that the setting of a date for selection is apt to lead to hasty choice of records by supervisors, and that the selection process by case workers in daily practice is the only valid one. We wished that each member of the Selection Committee could have time to read all the records submitted, and recommended that a longer time be given between the submitting of records and the date of the exhibit.

These are the trends we see in current practices which point also to a change of focus. We would like to see records for 1944 Exhibit illustrating these things:

1. Consultation service—in connection with O.C.D. in connection with everyday problems of children in community.
2. Coordination between family and child caring agencies—in regard to intake practices—i.e., referral by family agency of child already placed and acceptance of child caring agency of the child in his existing situation with intake study there rather than immediate transfer to agency study home.
3. Agency practice in regard to, and problems in connection with, financially adequate parents.
4. Foster day care.
5. Intake studies—criteria for intake—what goes into study; where does it end; relation of this to staff turnover.
6. Cases showing manipulation of environment.
7. Group therapy.
8. Changes in recording.
9. Use of summarized recording.

We are meeting in September to discuss some of the recommendations we made to the League, and to elect a 1944 chairman. You will be hearing from her in October. We wanted you to have the advantage of our experience, and a head start in selecting your records for the 1944 Exhibit.

Southern Regional Conference Postponed

THE regional committee of the Southern Regional Conference has voted to postpone until the spring the conference originally scheduled for November.

On Foster Day Care in Family Homes

THE June issue of *The Compass** has reported quite fully on Cleveland's experience in meeting the day care needs of children. The article, written in three parts, presenting the organization, the counseling service and the day care in family homes, is well worth reading in full. Because of the many requests for help with this problem, we want to call particular attention to Section III, dealing with foster family day care. A subcommittee charged with responsibility to set standards for such homes enunciates:

A. For whom foster family day care seems especially adapted:

1. Care for the young child or baby under two years of age where group care is obviously unsuitable from a health standpoint, emotional excitation, and expense.
2. Care for a child of any age where the parent works part-time or has other arrangements through members of the family for part of the day. For example, the mother works on second shift (3-11 p.m.) and needs care from 2 to 6 p.m., when the father can pick up the child.
3. Care for one pre-school and another school-age child where the use of a center for the pre-school child (if the center serves that group only) would involve the parents going two different places.
4. Care of the child with special health needs—cardiac, orthopedic conditions, mental retardation—where the child should not be with a group or cannot make use of group experience.
5. Temporary care pending establishment of a center.
6. Care for children in areas where the need is so scattered as not to justify a center from the point of view of numbers.

B. Who shall be eligible to place her child in a day care home? The following tentative criteria were evolved by a committee working on the question:

1. That the mother be employed or have demonstrated to the consultant her serious intention to be so within a very short period.
2. That the parent agree to have a physical examination for her child, including diphtheria immunization and vaccination, if she has not already done so.
3. That the parent be willing and financially able to pay cost of care (\$1.00 a day upwards) and to sign a contract with the foster parent to this effect, paying two weeks in advance.
4. That the parent agree to place his child in the home only in day-time hours (usually interpreted to be between hours of 6 a.m. and 7 p.m.) and not leave child overnight.
5. That parent provide rationed foods to be eaten by child in day care home or permit foster parent to make use of child's ration book.

There is recognition that while there are some parents who are competent and resourceful enough to need only information and who can carry the major responsibility for this service, very often a parent who is confused may be trying to use this service to solve a more basic problem. Such a parent needs the help of a case worker at intake. Furthermore, the question arises as to what is the consultant's responsibility after the placement to the child, the foster parent, the parent.

* Official publication of the American Association of Social Workers.

This article gives some interesting statistics on what this six-months' experiment proves. For example, "Out of the first thirty-three children placed, five left the homes during the first six weeks of placement. Only six out of ninety-six children in day care homes have been there longer than three months. . . . Two youngsters from the same family have 'worn out' three foster homes. . . ." There is this tentative conclusion: "Obviously it will mean some continued contacts with their parents, and so far our staff does not permit of continued sustained case work service."

Another question which this program pointed up is its relationship to the full-time placement program. This is a question with which many agencies have been concerned. When a parent requests day care as a "second best" plan because full-time placement is not possible, due to shortage of foster homes or other reasons, what chance of success has this "second best" plan? Also, what happens when, as this article goes on to state, "Many of these (parents) prevail upon foster day care parents to keep their children overnight and we find we have actually effected a true placement without the usual planning and safeguards provided by good child placement agencies. Should day care be a part of regular child placing services under established agency auspices, rather than as an emergency wartime service? At any rate it is closely related to such service and much interchange is necessary. Certainly on the basis of our experience, case workers experienced in the children's field are needed as consultants for continued case work service in the day care program that is meeting a need that has come into bold relief because of war conditions."

This article ends with the following summary:

"In summary it would seem that foster family day care stimulated by an emergency is an evolving social service which is likely to continue after the war, and which is a valuable supplement to group care for young children, being better equipped to meet special needs, short time needs and the care of very young children. Social workers have an opportunity and an obligation to participate in planning for such services, in staffing the case work staff and integrating the new service with already existing social services. This new service, too, entails a responsibility for understanding and interpreting the advantages and hazards of such care for parent, child, foster parent and community."

The BULLETIN invites comments from other communities where a foster home day care program is being developed.

—H. L. G.

Regional Conference

THE Ohio Valley Regional Conference will be held October 7 and 8, 1943, at the Granville Inn, Granville, Ohio. Mr. William I. Lacy, its chairman, announces that this conference has been limited to administrators and executives.

BOOK NOTES

All books reviewed are available to members, affiliates and associates for circulation on request to the League office.

IN QUEST OF FOSTER HOMES, by Dorothy Hutchinson, Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1943. \$1.75.

Miss Hutchinson's book, *In Quest of Foster Homes*, is an important addition to the literature on child placement. For the case worker who has lived through the last decade of homefinding practice and has experienced its changing styles and philosophies, her book has deep personal significance as well as professional validity. As Miss Hutchinson points out, homefinding has been a difficult task and one that is filled with anxiety for case workers as well as for foster applicants, but only recently have we begun to face our fear and our insecurity about it.

A book which considers the problems of selecting foster homes as frankly and clearly as does Miss Hutchinson's, is inevitably reassuring and encouraging to the case worker engaged in child placement. The changing philosophy of present-day practice is discussed in chapters covering our understanding of motivation; our use of first interviews, home visits, and references; the difficulties of refusing foster applicants, and the effect of the war on homefinding. Last, but not least, there is a short chapter of tribute to all of those generous foster mothers who have given of themselves to other people's children, "who never have and never could wholly belong to them," children who leave them for reasons beyond the control of either the foster parents or of the children.

Miss Hutchinson brings out of hiding and examines frankly the frightening aspects of homefinding. She labels them what they are and discusses our ability to use them consciously and constructively. This is especially true of her treatment of the subject of incentives. Mothering and "the desire for a child" are natural motivations. The person who wants only to earn money can do so more profitably other ways. One of the caseworker's major tasks is increased observation and the giving of more time and thought to understanding behavior and motivation. She needs to understand what are normal wishes and desires and what are exaggerated ones. Homefinding, like other aspects of case work, has evolved some of its present practice through the influence of psychiatry. The case worker has learned to consider not only what the prospective foster mother says, but the manner in which she tells it and how she behaves in the telling. The beginning homefinder can learn a great deal from this stress on observation of the bearing and composure of people as she talks with them.

Miss Hutchinson speaks for a frank approach to the people with whom we negotiate. As a result of experience and testing, she feels that there is a more realistic approach to prospective foster parents. The present way of getting started entails a mutual sizing-up process. The case worker and prospective foster mother need to arrive at some understanding of each other and there needs to be a willingness on the part of both to go on. We have moved away from "surprise inspection" to planned visits, and an explanation of why we do what we do and a presumption that we know what we are seeking and how we find it. Miss Hutchinson reminds us that it is important to remember that the foster mother does not want the agency. She wants a child and accepts the agency and case worker only as "necessary tools." Her willingness to seek out the case worker is one evidence of her willingness to accept the agency as a necessary tool. Comparison and contrast of the motivation of a prospective boarding mother with the motivation of a client indicate that the former does not see herself as needing help and "has decided on the solution of her problem if you want to call it a problem" when she applies to the agency for a child.

The much disputed subject of references is given its share of consideration. What to expect and what not to expect, how to use and not use them can be summed up in two statements: "What one seeks from a personal reference is knowledge to confirm one's own confidence in the applicant"; and "That the most profitable results we get from a 'character' and 'social reference' is some awareness of the status of the prospective foster family with regard to its popularity in the community and its general acceptability."

The chapter on refusing foster parents merited its separate appearance in a recent issue of *The Family*. The most difficult phase of homefinding, it is also one of the most vital because of its bearing on public relations. Here, too, Miss Hutchinson demonstrates her deep appreciation of the psychology of the case worker and of the prospective foster mother. She offers no one method of refusal and describes several, but underlying all must be the case worker's conviction that she has the right to evaluate all offers and that she is dealing with human beings in a "person-to-person relationship involving consideration, tact, and dignity."

The case material consists of well-chosen examples of what the case worker can observe and learn about family relationships and attitudes in her interviews. The illustrations are drawn from both adoption and boarding homes. Those from adoptive records are more detailed.

Throughout the book Miss Hutchinson stresses the humanness of foster parents; the normalness of certain patterns in people likely to become foster parents; and the change in case workers from previous fixed notions to greater flexibility and willingness to take people the way we find them; to learn to understand them and to use their homes for the "normal gifts with which they are already endowed."

The experienced placement worker will find in this book confirmation and reinforcement of her own philosophy. To anyone desirous of deepening her understanding and skill, it is a book which can profitably be read and re-read. It is a "must" for every case worker concerned with child placing.

—DEBORAH S. PORTNOY

*Supervisor, St. Louis Provident Association and
St. Louis Children's Aid Society, St. Louis, Missouri*

CHILDREN'S CENTERS: A guide for those who care for and about young children, issued by National Commission for Young Children, edited by Rose H. Alschuler, Wm. Morrow & Co., N. Y., 1942. \$1.50.

Through this publication the National Commission for Young Children has made a very helpful contribution to those who have responsibility for planning, building and equipping day nurseries or nursery schools, as well as to those with responsibility as teachers, and others caring for or advising regarding the care of young children. It is a timely guide for the many persons, including the paid professional and "lay volunteer," who are having to assist in the planning and administration of wartime nurseries where children of working mothers may receive care. This small readable volume of 149 pages, exclusive of the bibliography, gives in brief, concise form, the essentials in construction and program planning for such children's centers and outlines the contribution which these can make to the child's physical, social and intellectual development.

Early in the book a chapter is devoted to community organization and planning needed prior to the establishment of such centers which may well serve as a guide to communities concerned with the problems in determining the need for, and in the organization of, adequate facilities to care for young children in the war industry areas. In this and later chapters the contribution of the fields of education, health, psychology and social work to these child care facilities are recognized.

This volume should prove useful in the in-service training program for the nursery personnel in that it

gives a clear explanation of the points to observe in the guidance of the play activities and the daily routines, and how these can be made a constructive growth experience for the young child. The explanation of what may be expected of young children at various age levels, and the suggestions as to methods of helping them in learning the social give-and-take of every-day living should have practical value to those working directly with young children.

The photographs and line drawings of nursery school scenes and equipment, together with the up-to-date bibliography, add considerable to this usable volume.

—BERNICE E. SCROGGIE

*Supervisor, Division for Children, Washington State Department of
Social Security, Olympia, Washington*

In the Lending Library Available to Members, Affiliates and Associates

CHILD LABOR IN WARTIME, by Beulah Amidon, *Survey Mid-monthly*, June, 1943.

THE TRAGEDY OF BIRTH CERTIFICATES, by Elvira H. Brigg, *Survey Mid-monthly*, July, 1943.

PSYCHOLOGY OF PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILDREN IN WAR-TIME, six papers, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, July, 1943.

PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF UNMARRIED PARENTHOOD, by Florence Clothier, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, July, 1943.

COUNSELING AS SOCIAL CASE WORK, by Gordon Hamilton, *Social Service Review*, June, 1943.

THE PROGRAM FOR DAY CARE OF CHILDREN OF EMPLOYED MOTHERS, by Hazel A. Frederickson, *The Social Service Review*, June, 1943.

CHILD BEHAVIOR IN A NATION AT WAR, by George E. Gardner, *Mental Hygiene*, July, 1943.

SOME TREATMENT IMPLICATIONS IN THE USE OF HOME MAKER SERVICE, by Marjorie H. Boggs, *The Family*, May, 1943.

SUPERVISE HOME MAKER SERVICE: A METHOD OF CHILD CARE, U. S. Children's Bureau publication No. 296.

THE TEACHING OF VOLUNTEERS, by Ruth Gartland, *The Family*, June, 1943.

THE STAFF SCRUTINIZES CASE RECORDING, by W. Avrunin, J. Axelrode and R. Bernstein, *The Family*, July, 1943.

Reprinted Medical Form

As successors to the National Association of Day Nurseries, we have just reprinted the medical form for use in day care services. This form allows for initial examination, necessary tests, and space for routine check-ups. It is available at \$1.50 per hundred (plus postage) from the Child Welfare League of America.